The
REPORTER
For Conscience' Sake

VOLUME IX | MARCH-APRIL | Number 2

Registrants in I-O TOTAL 7,776

As of February, 1952, the latest date for which figures are available, there were 7,776 men in the I-O classification. The breakdown by states and territories is as follows:

U. S. and Territories	7,776
U. S. Continental	7,750
Alabama	40
Arizona	44
Arkansas	32
California	579
Colorado	47
Connecticut	26
Delaware	18
District of Columbia	8
Florida	70
Georgia	44
Idaho	52
Illinois	273
Indiana	749
Iowa	244
Kansas	513
Kentucky	27
Louisiana	15
Maine	22
Maryland	145
Massachusetts	41
Michigan	192
Minnesota	99
Mississippi	35
Missouri	166
Montana	79
Nebraska	139
Nevada	1
New Hampshire	5
New Jersey	92
New Mexico	14
New York City	20
New York (except N.Y.C.)	151
North Carolina	90
North Dakota	28
Ohio	1,236
Oklahoma	165
Oregon	212
Pennsylvania	1,095
Rhode Island	6
South Carolina	31
South Dakota	53
Tennessee	61

(Continued on page 2)

Details of CO Work Program Taking Shape But Not Yet Complete

While many of the specifics of the CO work program are taking on some shape, the actual program has not yet been put into operation. The forms to be used have not met with final approval by all agencies of the government concerned, although ultimate approval seems certain. While any present information is subject to final change, the general lines of the program will probably be similar to those indicated in the paragraphs which follow. *However, make no final plans on the basis of this tentative information.* A *Reporter* giving final information will be issued immediately after the forms are approved and the program is ready to be put into operation.

Form for Volunteering

Unless present plans change, there will be a printed form for use by I-O registrants, or by men who are seeking the I-O classification, who want to volunteer their services to the local board. At any time a draft-liable conscientious objector desires to volunteer, he will be able to obtain this form from the local board, fill it in, sign it, and return it to the local board. It will probably state that the registrant waives all personal appearance and appeal rights and that he will be ordered into prescribed civilian work at the convenience of the government. Thus it may be weeks, months, or even years after a registrant signs the form to volunteer before he is ordered into work.

Differing Concepts of Term "Volunteer"

It has been discovered in the course of long discussions of this subject that the term "volunteer" has a different meaning to government officials than to many conscientious objectors. To government officials, volunteering simply means that a registrant asks to have his name placed "at the head of the list" of men available for civilian service. A registrant simply asks for his name to be processed out of turn. According to government concept of volunteering, there is no guarantee that a registrant will secure the type of work for which he volunters. He might or he might not be ordered into the type of work which he volunteers, depending upon approval of the type of work for which he volunteers by the national or state offices of Selective Service, upon the attitude of the local board, and upon other factors.

In contrast to the government's concept of volunteering, the concept which many COs hoped would prevail is that a I-O registrant could volunteer for a specific type of work and have guarantee that this would be accepted. For example, if a registrant volunteered for work with a particular peace-church

(Continued on page 2)

MY CONTRIBUTION

I would like to contribute $_____ toward the working budget of the National Service Board for Religious Objectors for the purpose of helping COs facing problems in these perilous times.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____

( ) I am enclosing this amount.

( ) I plan to send this amount on or about _____ (month) (year)

Clip and mail with your remittance to the National Service Board, 1105 K Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C.

The Reporter

Published by the

National Service Board for Religious Objectors

1105 K Street, N.W.
Washington 5, D. C.

Board of Directors

Orie O. Miller, Chairman
W. Harold Row, Vice-Chairman
James A. Crain, Recording Secretary
Hubert F. Klemme, Treasurer
E. LeRoy Dakin

Executive Secretary and Reporter Editor

A. Stauffer Curry

Associate Secretary and Associate Editor

Elmer Neufeld

Consultative Counsel

Robert B. Myers

Office Secretaries

Letha Miller Ann Hunt Orletta Brandt
Verna Rapp Betty Hughes

Subscription: $1.00 Per Year

C O WORK PROGRAM

(Continued from page 1)

Service Committee, it was the hope that the registrant would be guaranteed work with that particular agency. According to present developments, if a registrant would volunteer for work with a given church Service Agency, he is given no guarantee of work with the agency.

However, there is some indication that a I-O registrant will not be able to secure employment with private non-profit agencies, as long as any work with public or governmental agencies is available, unless he volunteers his services. In summary, as things now appear, a registrant will not be able to work with private non-profit agencies, as long as work with governmental agencies is available, if he does not volunteer; if he does volunter, there is still some chance he will not be able to work with the private non-profit agency of his choice.

"Shall I Volunteer?"

The situation raises the question for many I-O registrants, "Shall I Volunteer?" If I cannot secure work with a private non-profit agency unless I volunteer, and yet have no guarantee of getting into this type of work if I do volunteer, should I risk getting into the program earlier than otherwise and perhaps still not secure employment with the agency of my choice?" Fortunately there seem to be some possible answers to this question. First, before ever contacting a local board, a registrant desiring work with a private non-profit agency should get in touch with the agency and be accepted by it for employment. A letter of acceptance by the non-profit agency is important. Second, the agency should be certain its job opportunities are approved by national or state Selective Service officials. The registrant should secure assurance of this approval from the agency. In all probability the agency will be on lists of employing agencies available for inspection at the local board office. Third, after following suggestions one and two above, he should discuss the matter with his local board, *before signing anything*. If the local board is in favor of the registrant's working with the agency of his choice in the job which he has been offered, it will then be the proper time to sign the form for volunteering, as plans now stand.

There will probably not be opportunity to withdraw a signed form for volunteering, if such forms are used. Therefore, a registrant should have his plans clearly in mind before signing a form for volunteering.

If, of course, a registrant wants to volunteer only for the purpose of rendering his two years of service as quickly as possible, without any particular choice of what he does, there is no reason why he should not proceed to volunteer whenever he desires.

Report for Physical Examination

When a local board begins processing a registrant prior to sending him an order to report for prescribed civilian service, they will probably begin by sending a Notice to Report for Armed Forces Physical Examination. (This processing will be the same, presumably, whether a registrant has signed a form volunteering his services, or has awaited to be called in regular order). This examination will, most probably, be at the same pace, and be administered under the same circumstances, as that given to I-A and I-A-O registrants.

Special Notice Form

If found acceptable (passes the physical), the I-O registrant will probably be sent a Special Notice to I-O Registrants. This will probably describe in detail the steps which are to be taken by the registrants. On this form, in a section called the Civilian Work Form, will be spaces for submitting three choices of types of work, giving previous employment experience, listing special skills and interests, showing ability in languages, describing educational background, and probably other items.

Ten days after this form is mailed to the registrant it is to be returned to the local board, with the registrants three choices of work designated. If the registrant fails to return the form, or if none of the types of work which the registrant chooses are considered appropriate by the local board, the local board will send a letter in which it submits three types of work which it thinks appropriate. Within ten days after the mailing of this letter, the registrant shall reply to the local board stating if any or all of the suggestions are or are not acceptable to the registrant. If any are acceptable, the local board will then send an Order to Report for Civilian Work, giving the place and hour of reporting. The order must be mailed at least ten days before the work is to begin.

If none of the board's suggestions are suitable to the registrant, a meeting will be held at which the registrant and local board, presumably in the presence of the representative of the State Director, will attempt to reach agreement on a job. If agreement is reached, the Order to Report for Civilian Work will be mailed. If no agreement is reached, the National Director will have to approve any Order to Report for Civilian Work before it is finally mailed by the local board.

Variations of This Procedure

Indications are that there will be variations of this procedure from state to state. For example, one State Director has tentatively arranged that I-O registrants will be sent to the county or local office of the Employment Service which will in turn send them to prospective employers for interviews. Other states will probably not work through employment service offices, but will have other methods of placement. It is believed, however, that general uniformity will prevail when final plans are released by Selective Service in Washington.

Caution: Remember these plans are purely tentative and no final action by any registrant should be based on them. Final plans will be published in a subsequent Reporter.

Elmer Neufeld Ill

Elmer Neufeld, Associate Secretary of NSBRO, has been ill for over a month, since March 18, but, as this goes to press, is about to return to work. We rejoice in his recovery.

Total I-Os (Continued from page 1)	
Texas	163
Utah	0
Vermont	8
Virginia	276
Washington	151
West Virginia	93
Wisconsin	96
Wyoming	4
Alaska	4
Hawaii	11
Puerto Rico	11
Virgin Islands	0

Private Non-Profit Agencies Are Now Suggesting Their Work Opportunities For Employment of COs to Government For O.K.

NSBRO Asked to Serve in Liaison and Coordinating Capacities

In keeping with the provision allowing COs to be employed by private non-profit organizations in work meeting certain requirements, many church and other private non-profit agencies are now planning to submit certain groups of their job opportunities to the national office of Selective Service for approval. To avoid duplication of effort and to insure the greatest degree of coordination of effort, Selective Service has asked that the presentation of these work opportunities by private non-profit agencies be coordinated through the office of the National Service Board.

No Special Form

No special forms for the submitting of these job opportunities for COs are needed. A simple letter with the following information will probably suffice:

(1) Complete description of the nature and purpose of the non-profit agency sponsoring the projects.
(2) A statement of the objectives of the work to be performed.
(3) A description of the actual jobs available.
(4) A listing of the total number of jobs available.
(5) A description of the general qualifications of men needed for various types of jobs.
(6) Any other data which would help to present as clearly as possible (1)the total character of the available employment opportunities as well as (2) the need for the services of COs.

Several methods of presenting these data on job opportunities to Selective Service headquarters in Washington can be used:

(1) Send data to NSBRO whose staff will interpret to national headquarters.
(2) Plan for representatives of the private non-profit agencies to present the data in person, after consulting with NSBRO staff who will make arrangements for making the presentation to national officials.

Several private non-profit agencies, chiefly church groups, have already made preliminary presentations of their job opportunities, while others are planning to do so in the next few weeks. Other agencies are considering the merits of presenting for approval job vacancies which may be filled by COs. Explorations are being made by NSBRO and others with non-profit agencies of various types regarding job openings for COs.

National and State Approval

Opportunities for overseas work will need approval only by the National Director of Selective Service, while domestic opportunities may need the approval of State Directors as well. It is felt best, however, to seek approval of the National Director first, at least in the initial stages of the program. The National Director could then persuade the State Directors, in cases where such persuasion may be necessary, to approve the job opportunities.

Total Organizational Approach Seen Best

At this stage it seems that approval of job opportunities, or "projects," should be done in terms of broad organizational groupings of opportunities rather than in terms of specific functions within organizations. For example, X denomination may have job openings with their relief or service agency, foreign missions board, national or home missions board, hospitals, old folks' homes, orphanages, and other agencies. While each of these agencies could submit their job opportunities for approval, it seems better for them to cooperate and submit their job openings in one grouping, or as one "project," in the name of X denomination. Thus a I-W registrant, once assigned to this denominational grouping or "project," could be transferred from one approved job to another within the overall "project," without checking back with Selective Service. If on the other hand, for example, various agencies within a denomination would seek separate approval it would probably be necessary to seek approval from the local board each time a transfer from one denominational agency to another is regarded as desirable by agency administrators. In some cases several denominations may find it desirable to consolidate their work opportunities into the larger grouping before submitting them for approval.

Many Types of Agencies May Seek Approval

A number of private non-profit agencies have already expressed interest in the employment of COs and are holding consultations of their leaders regarding their final policy in the matter. Many denominational bodies are calling special conferences or are holding inter-staff consultations in the process of making their decisions. Some interdenominational and non-denominational religious agencies are doing likewise. Several social service agencies have taken preliminary steps in this consideration. Some coordinating agencies for institutions such as old folks' homes, hospitals, and orphanages are giving ocnsideration to the employment of COs.

Concerned Persons Can Help Discover Opportunities

In view of the fact that many private non-profit agencies are known to be short of personnel, it seems that many

(Continued on page 8)

SUGGESTIONS FOR WORK OPPORTUNITIES

Following are the names and addresses of private non-profit organizations which I believe should be contacted regarding employment opportunities for conscientious objectors:

Name of Organization _____
_____
_____
Type of Service Rendered _____
_____
_____
Street _____
City or Town _____
State _____

Name of Organization _____
_____
_____
Type of Service Rendered _____
_____
_____
Street _____
City or Town _____
State _____

Signed: _____
Name
_____
Street
_____
Town or City State

(Use separate sheets if necessary. Clip and mail to National Service Board, 1105 K St., N. W. Washington 5, D. C.

Humphrey and Roosevelt Bills Would Allow Naturalization of COs

Two identical immigration and naturalization bills, S. 2842, introduced by Mr. Humphrey on March 12, and H.R. 7032, introduced into the House by Mr. Roosevelt on the same day, would allow the naturalization of conscientious objectors. These bills are regarded as substitutes to Senator McCarran's S. 2550 and Representative Walter's H.R. 5678. The "better" of the two sets of bills, on CO matters and most other aspects of immigration, are Humphrey's S. 2842 and Roosevelt's H.R. 7032. The following Senators, in addition to Mr. Humphrey, sponsored the Senate bill: Mr. Lehman, Mr. Benton, Mr. Langer, Mr. Kilgore, Mr. Douglas, Mr. McMahon, Mr. Green, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Moody, Mr. Murray, Mr. Kefauver and Mr. Morse.

It is uncertain how much chance the Humphrey and Roosevelt bills have of passage. Hearings were not held on them. The House may debate the Walter bill, H.R. 5678, shortly after Easter—probably by the time this article reaches its readers. Following is the language of H.R. 7032 and S. 2842.

Oath of Renunciation and Allegiance

"Sec. 337. (a) A person who has petitioned for naturalization shall, in order to be and before being admitted to citizenship, take in open court an oath (1) to support the Constitution of the United States; (2) to renounce and abjure absolutely and entirely all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which the petitioner was before a subject or citizen; (3) to support and defend the the Constitution and the laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; (4) to bear true faith and allegiance to the same; and (5) (A) to bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law, or (B) to perform noncombatant service in the armed forces of the United States when required by the law, or (C) to perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law:

Provided, That in the case of the naturalization of a child under the provisions of section 322 or 323 of this title the naturalization court may waive the taking of the oath if in opinion of the court the child is unable to understand its meaning. Any such person shall be required to take an oath containing the substance of clauses (1) through (5) of the preceding sentence, except that a person who shows by clear and convincing evidence to the satisfaction of the nationalization court that he is opposed to the bearing of arms in the armed forces of the United States by reason of religious training and belief shall be required to take an oath containing the substance of clauses (1) through (4) and clauses 5 (B) and 5 (C), and a person who shows by clear and convincing evidence to the satisfaction of the naturalization court that he is opposed to any type of service in the armed forces of the United States by reason of religious training and belief shall be required to take an oath containing the substance of clauses (1) through (4) and clause 5 (C)."

NATURALIZATION OF COs HAS LONG BACKGROUND OF LITIGATION

ROBERT MYERS, *Attorney*

The present Selective Service Law recognizes and makes provision for U. S. citizens religiously opposed to war.[1] If this is in recognition of the essential validity of religious objection to war, and if pacifism in the general sense of the word is "in harmony with the constitution and policy of our government" as the Supreme Court stated in 1929 in the Schimmer case,[2] then it would seem paradoxical for the U. S. Government to take the position that aliens religiously opposed to war should be denied citizenship for that reason. Nevertheless, there is now pending in Congress proposed legislation which might very well have that effect.[3] The Supreme Court has repeatedly held that there is no constitutional bar to the passage of legislation which would exclude all persons from citizenship who refused regular military service, so the type of naturalization statute adopted by Congress is of vital importance to the nation in general and to pacifists in particular.

The first Naturalization Act was passed in 1790, and another one succeeded it in 1795. There were no major changes until the Act of 1906,[4] which contained the following oath of allegiance:

"I hereby declare, on oath, that I ... will support and defend the constitution and laws of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic, and bear true faith and allegiance to same."

When the Naturalization Act was again revised in 1940,[5] the old 1906 Oath of Allegiance was retained in substantially the same form.

Following World War I, a fervent nationalism engulfed the country, and for the first time the question of the eligibility for U. S. citizenship of an alien opposed to bearing arms really became an issue. The Immigration and Naturalization Service commenced asking in its preliminary forms whether the applicant would bear arms if called upon to do so by the government. The first Supreme Court test on the question came in 1929 when pacifist *Roskita Schimmer's* case[6] was brought before it. And two years later, the Supreme Court was again called upon to decide the eligibility for citizenship of Clergyman Douglas *Macintosh*[7] and of Episcopal nurse Marie *Bland*.[8] The Court turned them all down, stating in effect that new citizens must promise to bear arms.

After the reenactment of the 1906 Oath into the 1940 Act, the matter was again presented to the Supreme Court for decision.[9] This time, the Court, by a 5 to 3 vote, flatly and frankly reversed its Schimmer, Macintosh and Bland decisions, and declared that James *Girouard*, a Seventh Day Adventist opposed to combatant service, was eligible for citizenship. It said that the Oath did not specifically state that a new citizen must bear arms, and it further pointed out that conscientious objection to war is no bar to holding high public office in the United States,[9a] and that

(Continued on page 8)

1. Universal Military Training and Service Act, as Amended (Public Law 51, 82nd Congress, 1951), Section 6(j).

2. U. S. v. SCHIMMER, 279 U.S. 644 at 652.

3. Senate Bill 2550 (Immigration and Nationality Act), Jan. 29, 1952. H. R. 5678 (Immigration and Nationality Act), Oct. 9, 1951.

4. Naturalization Act of 1906, Sec. 4, 34 Stat. 596.

5. Nationality Act of 1940, 54 Stat. 1137, 8 U.S.C.

6. U. S. v. SCHIMMER, 279, U. S. 644.

7. U. S. v. MACINTOSH, 283 U. S. 605.

8. U. S. v. BLAND, 283 U. S. 636.

9. GIROUARD v. U. S., 328 U. S. 61, 66 Succt. 826 (1946).

Job Referral Services For COs Set Up By NSB and Constituent Agencies

Many of the constituent bodies on the Consultative Council, as well as the National Service Board itself, have established Referral Services for I-O registrants seeking suitable work assignments. NSB is daily receiving a flow of requests for information on procedures in discovering suitable available job opportunities. A similar stream of requests has been reported by headquarters office of agencies affiliated with NSB. This stream of requests comes to both so-called "historic" and "non-historic" peace churches.

It seems apparent that many conscientious objectors will seek employment for two years, in lieu of induction, with the denominations of which they are members in service projects of various types. At this writing, it seems apparent also that many denominations are not prepared to employ in the immediate future all of their I-O members who may seek employment with them. The limited scope of work opportunities, as well as limited budgets within denominations, seem to be factors in limiting opportunities of employment within agencies. Therefore, the need for a referral service by many of these bodies seems imperative in order to assist conscientious objectors in finding the employment most in keeping with the great needs of humanity and the individual abilities of the I-O registrants.

It seems possible, on the other hand, that some objectors will not seek employment with their denominational headquarters, because much of the work with these groups is uncompensated and is on a subsistence basis. Men with wives, for example, may seek employment with state agencies where there may be greater opportunity for remuneration adequate to care for a family. Indications are, however, that most employment opportunities available to COs will not involve high salaries.

Whom to Contact

Many objectors will be anxious to know the leaders of their religious bodies whom they might contact if interested in employment with religious agencies; *THE REPORTER* therefore is publishing the list of agencies below, many of which are affiliated with the NSBRO Consultative Council. Some, but not all, of these have referral services.

American Unitarian Association
Dr. Merrill E. Bush, 25 Beacon Street, Boston 8, Massachusetts.

Assemblies of God
Dr. J. Roswell Flower, 434 West Pacific, Springfield 1, Missouri.

American Baptist Home Mission Society
Rev. Don Cloward, 152 Madison Avenue, New York 10, New York.

American Friends Service Committee
Lewis Hoskins, 20 S. 12th Street, Philadelphia 7, Pennsylvania.

Brethren Service Commission
Dr. W. Harold Row, 22 S. State Street, Elgin, Illinois

Christadelphian Central Committee
Russell Dixon, 14 Browning Street, Baldwin, Long Island, New York.
Clarence M. Roth, 18 Hoffman Boulevard, East Orange, New Jersey

Christadelphian Service Committee
Carl B. George, 3330 N. 15th Street, Philadelphia 40, Pennsylvania

Christ's Sanctified Holy Church
T. F. Barker, 910 C Avenue, West Columbia, South Carolina.

Commission on Peace and Conscription, Church of God
Dr. Russell Olt, Anderson, Indiana.

Christian Catholic Apostolic Church
Rev. Carl Lee, Zion, Illinois.

Church of the Gospel
Rev. Howard E. Green, 43 Appleton Avenue, Pittsfield, Massachusetts.

Church of God (7th Day)
W. H. Olson, 538 9th Street, S. E., Washington, D. C.

Church of Jesus Christ
Rev. Leah L. Harshman, 611 S. Hamilton St., Sullivan, Illinois.

Congregational Christian Churches of U.S.A.
Rev. Alfred Schmalz, 16 Brookside Road, Darien, Connecticut.

Disciples of Christ
Dr. James A. Crain, 222 S. Downey Avenue, Indianapolis, Indiana.

Dunkard Brethren
Elder Lewis B. Flohr, Box 236, Vienna, Virginia.

Essenes of Kosmon
Wing Anderson, Kosmon Industries, 2008 W. 11th Street, Los Angeles, California.

Evangelical and Reformed Church
Dr. Huber F. Klemme, 2909 W. 25th Street, Cleveland 13, Ohio.

Evangelical Mission Covenant Church of America
Rev. Theodore W. Anderson, 5101 N. Francisco Avenue, Chicago 25, Illinois.

Episcopal Pacifist Fellowship
Mrs. Henry Hill Pierce, 9 East 84th Street, New York, New York.

Evangelical United Brethren Church
Dr. Hermann Kaebnick, 1442 U. B. Bldg., Dayton 2, Ohio.

Emmanuel Association
Rev. Robert Finch, 220 Elmer Street, Vineland, N. J.

First Divine Association in America
Elmo Knocke, Box 38, Yoakum, Texas.

Free Methodist Church of N. A.
Rev. Ernest Keasling, Methodist Headquarters, Winona Lake, Indiana.

Full Gospel Conference of the World
Rev. Fred C. Hahn, Box 215, Niles, California.

Full Gospel Tabernacle
Rev. A. H. Drake, 1021 C Street, Reedley, California.

Friends in Israel
Rev. R. W. Hill, Rt. 2, Box 29, Mt. Gilead, North Carolina.

Fellowship of Reconciliation
Dr. A. J. Muste, 21 Audubon, New York, New York.

Gracelawn Assembly
Ralph H. Didier, 650 East Bishop, Flint, Michigan

Mennonite Central Committee
Orie O. Miller, MCC, Akron, Pennsylvania.

Methodist Commission on World Peace
Dr. Charles Boss, Jr., 740 Rush Street, Chicago 11, Illinois.

Molokan Advisory Council
John H. Berokoff, 335 S. State Street, Los Angeles, California.

National Bible Institution
J. Arlan March, 1907 Latham Street, Rockford, Illinois

National Council of the Y.M.C.A.
George B. Corwin, 291 Broadway Avenue, New York 7, New York.

National Council of Churches
Rev. Ernest Lefever, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York, New York.

Olazabal Council of Latin-America Church, Inc.
Rev. Andreas Aguilar, 170 S. Indiana St., Los Angeles 33, California.

Old German Baptist Brethren
J. W. Skiles, Route 1, Rossville, Indiana.

Peace Association of Christian Scientists
Evelyn Owings, Owings Mills, Maryland.

Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
Rev. H. G. Lofquist, 17 D'Arcy Lane, Asheville, North Carolina.

Presbyterian Church U.S.A.
Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Pentecostal Fire-Baptized Church
Rev. A. O. Hood, Jefferson, Georgia.

Rabbinical Assembly of America
Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Earl Hall, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Reformed Church in America
Rev. Martin A. deWolfe, 5 Morris Avenue, Schenectady, New York.

Seventh Day Adventist
Elder Carlyle B. Haynes, 6840 Eastern Ave., Washington 12, D. C.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Doris Shamleffer, 328 N. Charles Street, Baltimore Maryland.

Board of Social Mission of the Lutheran Church
Dr. C. Franklin Koch, 231 Madison Avenue, New York 16, New York.

Pentecostal Friends (Rogerine Quakers)
Fred Watrous, Mystic, Connecticut.

United Pentecostal
Rev. S. W. Chambers, 3449 S. Grand Blvd., St. Louis, Missouri.

TOTAL OF 2,090 APPEALS TO NATIONAL BOARD SINCE 1948

Following is the text of an article from a recent Selective Service Monthly Bulletin:

"Two thousand ninety appeals have been taken to the President under the present Universal Military Training and Service Act up to March 15, 1952, according to Martin V. Coffey, Chairman, National Selective Service Appeal Board. Of these, 1,860 have been adjudicated.

"One hundred eight-three appeals were received by this board in January, 184 in February, and 98 in the first 2 weeks of March. Five hundred eighty-four appeals have been adjudicated since January 1, 1952.

"Mr. Coffey said that processing of appeals now begins immediately upon receipt of the cover sheet and there is no backlog. Two hundred thirty appeals are in process of adjudication at the present time.

"Some appeals take considerably longer than others to adjudicate because the board has found it necessary to request additional information where the cover sheet does not contain sufficient evidence for the board to arrive at a decision."

Peace Church Officials Contact State Directors

State SSS Directors' Attitudes Both Encouraging and Discouraging

In the past several months, certain historic peace church officials have contacted State Directors of Selective Service to discuss the CO work program. The lead in making these contacts was taken by officials of the Mennonite Central Committee, who were accompanied, on some occasions, by Brethren, Quaker, and NSB workers. Complete details of these contacts were shared with the Consultative Council through the NSB office.

The findings in these contacts were at the same time encouraging and discouraging. On the discouraging side were the facts that some Directors did not show any interest in the problem of conscience. Some flatly stated that they will not have COs render service in their state. On the encouraging side, several Directors have already laid very articulate plans for helping the conscientious objector to find work in significant vocations in keeping with the COs religious scruples.

One director, who is himself an official of a community cooperative welfare agency, suggested that perhaps conscientious objectors could serve as counselors in summer camps, caretakers in local churches, and as workers in other social service agencies. Unfortunately, on the other hand, some Directors indicated the existance of a somewhat punitive attitude toward conscientious objectors. On the whole, however, State Directors and their assistants on the CO work program were very receptive to the visits of church agency leaders and expressed the desire to respect the scruples of COs to the fullest extent possible.

State CO Committees Indicated

In some of these contacts with State officials, the importance of having state leaders of CO groups alerted to the need of keeping in touch with state officials was indicated. For example, one worker suggested a situation of feeling "lonely" in working on CO placement and expressed gratitude for the visits of interested officials.

It has been suggested that state leaders of peace agencies, denominations (both so-called historic and non-historic), be alert to the importance of working cooperatively, either as informal committees or otherwise, on behalf of COs in relation to the State Selective Service System.

CONGREGATIONAL CHRISTIAN COMMITTEE ON COs RELEASES INFORMATION

A very effective release was recently issued by the Committee on Conscientious Objectors of the Congregation Christian Churches, the Rev. Alfred Schmalz, Darien, Connecticut, chairman. Following a description of the law, the release has a section, "Steps a CO Should Take," in which the following advice is given:

"A person seeking the status of a CO should write to the National Service Board, 1105 K St., N. W., Washington 5, D. C., asking for full information on filling out his questionnaire and on "Civilian Work Regulations.'

"He should write to the Committee on Conscientious Objectors of the Congregational Christian Churches, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N. Y., requesting a Registration Blank, on which he can tell us whether he is interested in possible work opportunities with our Churches in relief and reconstruction."

In the section of the release, "What Pastors Can Do," pastors are "asked to make known the information in this communication to any members of their Churches who will be seeking CO status. The Committee will provide Registration Blanks on request."

The Registration Blank for Congregational Christian COs quotes the statement of the General Council of the Church adopted in 1950 regarding COs, asks for the classification of the man registering with the CO Committee, and inquiries if he is interested in work opportunities under the law, with the Congregational Christian Churches, "in relief and reconstruction, or in a missions agency?" A registrant desiring to work with the Congregational Christian Church will be sent an application form.

BAPTISTS COMPILE CO STATEMENTS

"The American Baptist Convention and the Conscientious Objector" is the title of a mimeographed pamphlet recently released by the Council on Christian Social Progress of this denomination. Statements were adopted by each Annual Convention since 1941, except in 1945 when there was no Convention, and in 1949 when the Convention simply affirmed previous statements. Copies can can be secured by writing the Council on Christian Social Progress, 152 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

Jehovah's Witnesses Submit Booklet

A booklet of 64 pages in length was presented by Jehovah's Witnesses to the National Director of Selective Service and to members of the National Selective Service (Presidential) Appeal Board. It contains a condensed theology of this group, a description of the various types of ministers in the group, the relationship of self-support to the ministry, a statement that JWs are entitled to the CO classification, some court opinions, and other information.

The purpose of this booklet is to acquaint high officials, and others, with the particular beliefs of Jehovah's Witnesses. It is most interesting and helpful.

While many religious sects and denominations differ vastly from Jehovah's Witnesses in many of their tenets, it may be wise for many groups to summarize their beliefs on conscientious objection to draft officials.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Tradition and Challenge, by Harold Chance, American Friends Service Committee, 20 S. 12th St., Philidelphia 7, Pennsylvania.

The Spirit of the underlying philosophy of this publication is contained in the first paragraph:

"Pacifism has never been a dogma among Friends. It has, however, always been a compelling testimony, an integral part of their philosophy, their religious belief, and their way of life. It is for this Peace Testimony that Friends are best known in the world today, while at the same time, this Testimony forms one of the liveliest contemporary issues within the Society of Friends. It is the spiritual basis and the historical development of this Testimony that we want to trace."

This is significant reading, not only for Friends, but for all interested in the peaceful way of life.

* * *

God and War, by J. Irvin Lehman, Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa., 1951. Price: 25 cents.

This sixty-three page book delves into both the Old and New Testament backgrounds of the belief in non-resistance. It expresses in a distinctive way the Mennonite point of view. Sample chapter headings: Concluding Observation on the Old Testament Covenant and Its Revelation of God; the New Testament Revelation of God in Christ; the Judgment of God Will Come.

FREQUENT QUESTION: I AM IN I-O BUT FEEL I AM ALSO ELIGIBLE FOR III-A, II-C, OR SOME OTHER CLASSIFICATION LOWER ON THE LIST. WHAT SHALL I DO?

Answer: Every man is entitled to the lowest classification for which he is eligible. However, we have had recent sad experience that leads us to suggest great care and tact in making claims for a classification lower than I-O. The important thing is to be clear in one's witness to his religious scruples. Several local boards have examined the claims of men for classifications lower than I-O, and have decided that, after all, the registrant was more concerned about a deferment than he was about expressing his religious beliefs. It is almost universally the case that draft-liable men are interested in continuing in their chosen occupation and do not like to have their career interrupted. This is a normal desire for a man attempting to take his place in a free society. But when a board concludes, rightly or wrongly, that a I-O registrant shows greater concern about a lower classification than he shows about his religious scruples, they are apt to place the registrant in IA or I-A-O. The fact is that this has happened a number of times recently.

Our suggestion is that, when registrants' situations change and they are apparently eligible for a II-C or III-A, that they take great care in reaffirming their religious beliefs and their willingness to accept civilian work if necessary, in the same letter in which they describe their eligibility for deferment with II-C, III-A, or other classification lower than I-O. This will assure the local board of the continuing sincerity of the registrant regarding his religious beliefs.

A NOTE ON STUDENT DEFERMENTS FOR COs

Due to a technicality of wording in Selective Service regulation 1622.15 (b), it is possible for a college student to request a I-S statutory deferment even thought he previously may have received a I-S deferment as a high school student.

STATE DIRECTORS LISTS AVAILABLE

Because of the length involved, it does not seem feasible to print the names of all State Directors in the *Reporter* at this time. However, a complete, up-to-date list has been mimeographed and is available by writing to NSBRO, 1105 K Street, N. W., Washington 5, D. C.

Send twenty cents to cover cost of reproduction and mailing.

SOME STATE DIRECTORS HAVE DEVISED THEIR OWN CO FORMS

Several State Directors, particularly the Director for Oregon, have devised their own forms for use by men in submitting their choices of work. I-O registrants have been asked to fill in this form within ten days after the date of mailing to the registrant. This obviously causes confusion in the mind of the registrant. Therefore, the matter was taken up with the national office, which in turn took up the matter with the Oregon Director. It was explained by the latter that this questionnaire was more in the nature of a survey to discover what types of work the I-O registrants desired to do and what qualifications they had for doing the work.

Our advice is that registrants from Oregon should fill in the questionnaire as requested, but they should explain to local boards that it is their understanding that the forms for use on a national level have not yet been circulated and that they hope the State Director will wait until such time before taking any further action.

We predict the Oregon State Director will soon discontinue the use of these forms and use instead the forms still to be prepared by the national office.

Several local boards have also devised their own forms. The State Director of North Carolina, in which a certain local board had circulated its own forms, has advised this local board to discontinue the practice.

POSTPONEMENT OF INDUCTION FOR LAW SCHOOL GRADUATES

Selective Service Local Board Memorandum No. 44, issued January 31, 1952, provides that a new school graduate can ask his local board for a postponement of an *order to report for induction* so that he can take his bar examination. Selective Service headquarters has advised men that a I-O law graduate will have the same right to request a postponement of an *order to report for civilian work.*

The postponement, which is mandatory on the local board, is effective "until the day following the last day" of the State bar examination to be held next following the student's graduation from law school. The student's classification is not affected by the postponement, and he will be included with the draft call upon the local board "next following such postponed date."

I-O CLASSIFICATIONS MAY BE REOPENED

Preliminary word indicates that all men in I-O, and all those still listed IV-E by certain boards, will be reopened before being processed for I-W work orders. This means that many men now in I-O (or IV-E) will be considered for classifications lower on the list for which they are eligible. Presumably many will receive III-A, II-C, or other classification lower than I-O.

On the other hand, some boards may take the occasion to look for reasons, which, in their minds, justify their putting some I-Os into I-A or I-A-O. Therefore, it might be well for all I-O registrants to examine all the materials in their file, supporting any claims for I-O or classification lower on the list than I-O. Send for NSB's "How to Fill in Form 150." After reading it perhaps some men would like to add additional evidence to their files supporting their claims. This is important, particularly if the file is sent to the State or National Appeal Boards, or to any other officials for review.

Data supporting any claim for a classification lower on the list than I-O should also be filed as completely as possible.

EVIDENCE IN FILE CAN BE "TOO SMOOTH"

From a reliable source it has been learned that evidence in a file can be so "smooth"—to use the words of our source—as to reveal that some other persons than that CO registrant wrote it. If the original "papers" in a I-O's file are much more clear and articulate than a letter the registrant obviously wrote at an earlier or later date, it is evidence that the registrant himself did not write the original statement, according to our informant. To allow a lawyer, said this source, to write the papers in a file in itself may indict the I-O registrant. If everything in a file is too well balanced it tends to arouse suspicion. A resourceful, original answer, even though the logic is not perfect, places a registrant in a better position, said our informant. Reasonableness and good humor are better than a strictly legal argument with a draft board, it was observed.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The point of view above may not be that of all local boards, appeal boards, state directors, or national officials, but it may be helpful to khow how some officials view the matter.

Lack of Appropriations Reported to Delay CO Work Program

Failure of a Congressional Committee to grant a request of Selective Service for $150,000 to operate the work program for conscientious objectors is reported to have delayed the prescribed work program for COs. On March 7, 1952, report No. 1503, accompanying the Third Supplemental Appropriations bill of the same date, stated that "the committee is not in accord with the conscientious objector program as presented and has denied funds for putting it into operation." An amount of $150,000 for this purpose was requested by Selective Service. The committee further went on to state that "the sum of $15,000 has been provided for administrative expenses in connection with this activity and is provided in order that further consideration may be given this problem." The House passed the bill in this form. It then went to the Senate.

At the time this is written, the Senate Appropriations Committee has just completed action on the bill and has reported it to the Senate in the same form as passed by the House. The bill, if passed by the Senate, will then go to a Conference Committee of both House and Senate for final action. It may be several weeks before the final outcome of this legislation is known. Meantime in all probablity the CO work program will continue to be delayed.

House Committee Hearings

Pages 172 to 185 of the Hearings on the Third Supplemental Appropriations Bill for 1952 give a verbatim report on the testimony of General Hershey and his assistants on the Selective Service askings. Much of this has to do with the conscientious objector program.

NOTE: This entire testimony can be secured from the National Service Board for Religious Objectors by sending in twenty cents and requesting the same.

PRIVATE AGENCIES

(Continued from page 3)

job openings for COs should emerge. Presumably much of the work with these agencies would fill the needs of COs in terms of capabilities, personal interest, and the desire for work in which they can express the service motive. Two things are needed: (1) to discover possible job openings, and (2) to interpret to administrators of these agencies the significance of seeking to make arrangements to employ COs. The latter may in some cases be more difficult.

NATURALIZATION LITIGATION

(Continued from page 4)

9a. Art. VI, Sec. 3 of the Constitution says that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

"it is hard to believe that one need forsake his religious scruples to become a citizen but not to sit in the high councils of state.[10]

10. GIROUARD v. U. S., 328 U. S. 61 at 66.

As a logical next step, the Supreme Court, when faced in 1950 with the case of an alien applicant who was opposed to all forms of military service, ruled that he too was eligible for citizenship[11]

11. COHNSTAEDT v. U. S., Cert. 338 U. S. 890, 339 U. S. 901 (1950).

under the 1940 Naturalization Act.

While the 1940 Act was in force, at least one lower federal court ruled in 1948 that an alien was eligible for citizenship even though his objection to bearing arms was not based on religious scruples,[12] and it may be that

12. PETITION OF CRESCENZI, D. C., N. Y. 1948, 79 F Sup. 461.

this and other similar cases led Congress to materially change the Oath when it enacted the Internal Security Act.[13] In fact, Congress voted in two

13. INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950, Public Law 831, 81st Congress.

Oaths, one exacting a declaration of willingness to bear arms,[14] followed by

14. (Here insert the First Oath of 1950 Act).

an alternative oath which could be taken by aliens religiously opposed to military service.[15]

15. (Here insert the Alternate Oath of 1950 Act).

NSB DIRECTORS AND CONSULTATIVE COUNCIL MEET MARCH 5-6

The Board of Directors and Consultative Council of NSBRO met in Washington on Wednesday and Thursday, March 5 and 6. The meeting of the Directors was the regular quarterly Board meeting.

Both meetings centered in attempts to discover, through analyses of the CO Regulations and by consultation with several Selective Service officials, the meaning and the possible methods to be used in administering the various details of the CO work program. Because of the fact that the final forms to be used were not yet approved by Selective Service, and because other details were not yet planned by the national and State Selective Service offices, only general concepts and procedures were gleaned in the meeting.

Those present, both as members and visitors, in the Board of Directors meeting were as follows: Orie O. Miller (MCC) Chairman, W. Harold Row (BSC) Vice Chairman, Huber F. Klemme (E & R), Treasurer, George Loft (AFSC), Tom Potts (AFSC), William T. Snyder (MCC), Ora Huston (BSC), Herman Will, Jr. (CWP, Methodist), Ernest Lefever (NCCC), Merton Scott (Friends' Five Years), Lou Schneider (AFSC), A. S. Curry (NSB), Elmer Neufeld (NSB).

Representatives of many of the constituent bodies on the Consultative Council were present at the meeting on March 6. Colonel Kosch and Mr. Olsen led a period of discussion with the Consultative Council, while those in attendance at the Board of Directors meeting had a conference with General Hershey.

LAWYERS PANEL

In various previous issues of *The Reporter* reference was made to a lawyers' panel which is being compiled in the NSB office. This list now contains 131 names. Robert Myers, attorney retained by NSB, has been in touch with many of these lawyers as cases arise.

THE REPORTER
1105 K Street, N. W.
Washington 5, D. C.

Forwarding Postage Guaranteed

Sec. 34.66, P. L. & R.
U. S. POSTAGE
PAID
Washington, D. C.
Permit No. 5540

Form 3547 Requested

WAKE